

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/761,827 | SUN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Caixia Lu | Art Unit 1713 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Caixia Lu (3) James Chu
 (2) Manni Li (4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 January 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant
 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants representatives have indicated that Structures IA-4, IB-4, IIA-4 and IIB-4 of pages 3 and 6 of the patent application publication (US 2005/0004331) as the support of claims 12 and 14. It appears that claims 14 is supported, however, it is the examiner's position that claims 12 is only partially supported since the definition of D of claim 12 is not limited to only N or NR group as the indicated formulas. Furthermore, applicants indicate: to provide evidence to show that the definition of "hydrocarbyl" is a monovalent group, thus, the complex of claim 14 will no longer be anticipated by the structure of (XVII) of col. 18 of US 6,531,424 cited in the previous Office action.